

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13 and 25 are amended herein to address claim objections. No new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 9, 12, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Higginbotham et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,575), hereafter referred to as Higginbotham in view of Lebby et al. (US Patent No. 5,534,888), hereafter referred to as Lebby. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

a display device coupled to said bus and comprising a viewing panel viewable from a front side and a back side, wherein a first set of text is displayable on said front side and a second set of text is displayable on said back side wherein said second set of text is sequentially after sequential to said first set of text; and

a display device controller coupled to said bus and for sensing orientation and rotation of said display device, and in response thereto for displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequentially after sequential to said second set of text.

Claim 1 includes the limitation of displaying sequential text on both sides of the display device which is very different from Higginbotham. Claim 1 recites Serial No. 09/874,473
Examiner: Nguyen, Kimnhung

Art Unit: 2674

the limitation, " in response thereto for displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text." This embodiment of the present invention responds to rotation of the display device by displaying a next set of text that is sequential to the text displayed on the back side of the display device. Applicants respectfully submit that Higginbotham fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation of the present invention as recited in amended Claim 1.

Higginbotham purports to teach correcting the orientation of a single image in response to opening or closing the display device (column 4 lines 34-40). Higginbotham actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention because the display of Higginbotham only corrects the orientation of the image already displayed on the device. The instant embodiment of the present invention responds to rotation of the device by providing a sequentially next set of data on the side that is viewable by the user. Higginbotham fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

For Higginbotham, the only factor that initiates a change of the image is opening or closing the display unit. However, the present invention "senses orientation and rotation," as claimed and responds by "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text sequential to said second set of text," as claimed.

Lebby fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham. The rejection cites Lebby Figures 2-3 and 4-5 as teaching an electronic book. However, Lebby and the claimed invention are very different. The present invention recites "in response thereto for displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed in Claim 1. With this claimed embodiment, a third sequential set of text is displayed on the front side of the display in response to rotating the display device.

In contrast, Lebby teaches in column 3 lines 56 "turning an individual page of the plurality of page displays 116 enables electronics 130 to update the plurality of page displays 116, thereby enabling the user to look back and forth through the displayed information on the plurality of page displays 116 so as to obtain a complete overall scope of the displayed material." With the display of Lebby, turning a page backwards causes the electronic book to display a previous set of text that is not sequential to the text last viewed on the opposite side of the display. This teaches away from "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text." Implementing the claimed limitation on the display of Lebby would require a user to read the electronic book of Lebby backwards.

For this rational, Claim 1 is patentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby. As such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and allowance of Claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-6, 9 and 12 depend from Claim 1 and therefore Claims 2-6, 9 and 12 overcome the rejections and are also in condition for allowance. Independent Claim 25 recites similar limitations of Claim 1. As such, Claims 25 and 29 overcome the rejections and are also in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,888), hereafter referred to as Lebby further yet in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,575), hereafter referred to as Moon. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, the combination of Higginbotham and Lebby fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations of Claim 1. The combination of Higginbotham and Lebby alone, or taken in combination with Moon fail to teach or suggest "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequentially after said second set of text," as claimed.

Moon fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham and Lebby. Moon may purport to teach rotating a display about a vertical axis, however, Moon fails to teach or suggest "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed. For this rational, Claim 7 is patentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby and further in view of Moon. As such, Claim 7 is in condition for allowance and allowance of Claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby further yet in view of Borgstrom et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,908), hereafter referred to as Borgstrom. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, the combination of Higginbotham and Lebby fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of independent Claim 1. Borgstrom fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham and Lebby. Borgstrom purports to teach a system and method for using an electronic device. However, Borgstrom fails to teach or suggest "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed. As a result, Claims 8 and 10-11 are patentable over the combination of Higginbotham and Lebby in view of Borgstrom. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of Claims 8 and 10-11 for the foregoing rational.

Claims 13-18, 20 24 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higginbotham and Lebby in view of Register (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,170), hereafter referred to as Register. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Independent Claim 13 includes the limitation of "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed. As stated above, the combination of Higginbotham and Lebby fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation.

Register fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham and Lebby. Register may purport to teach a secondary display system for a computer including a hinge. However, Register fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended Claim 13 including displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text, as claimed. For the foregoing rational, Claims 13-18, 20 24 and 26 are patentable over Higginbotham and Lebby in view of Register. As such, Claims 13-18, 20 24 and 26 are in condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 13-18, 20 24 and 26 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 19, 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Higginbotham, Lebby, and Register further yet in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,170), hereafter referred to as Moon. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, the combination of Higginbotham, Register and Lebby fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of independent Claims 13 and 25. Moon fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham, Lebby and Register. Moon purports to teach a portable computer display tilt/swivel mechanism and method. However, Moon fails to teach or suggest "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed. In fact, Moon fails to teach or suggest displaying multiple images or sets of data at all. As a result, Claims 19, 27-28 are patentable over the combination of Higginbotham, Lebby and Register in view of Moon. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of Claims 19, 27-28 for the foregoing rational.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby, in view of Register as applied to Claim 13 above, and further in view of Borgstrom. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, Higginbotham alone, or taken in combination with Register and Lebby fail to teach or suggest the claim limitation of "displaying a third set of text on said front side wherein said third set of text is sequential to said second set of text," as claimed in amended independent Claims 1, 13 and 25. Borgstrom fails to remedy the deficiencies of Higginbotham, Lebby and Register for the rational presented above. As such, Claims 21-23 are patentable over Higginbotham in view of Lebby, in view of Register and further yet, in view of Borgstrom. As such, Claims 21-23 are in condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 21-23 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 4/14, 2004



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060